Collected Articles Of J.J Barger

WHAT EVEN IS TOLERANCE?

I'm using this image as a way to show the hypocrisy of the left. true left (almost non-existent in America) is not the problem, but the false left (very prominent in America). A little anecdote: one day I was banished from a place I'd rather not give attention to (it was a coffee shop), for being "beligerent with my views and taking coffee for free" (I was poor, forgive me (I will get to that in a brief moment). a few months later B&N banned me for "looking and talking threatening". I was doing neither. The problem with the image above is that not only is it a social issue, but also a kind of "gotcha" to show how little working class lives matter to liberals. Most working class and below individuals a) wouldn't be able to afford their overpriced cuisine nor b) if they could they'd get kicked out. Most places like this used to be places where any person and their friends could argue about social issues and economic issues. That was

ages ago. This in turn will drive most of us to dive bars and not restaurants full of champagne socialists who pretend to care about the working class (as long as they are not white, obviously). This cultural and economic shift will pit the underclass and working class whites against of a barrage of "everyone else". Now everything from Planet Fatness to Trotsky Hen is pushing this whole narrative to kick people out that don't fit into the liberal utopia globalist fantasy. While I'm not the biggest fan of Sarah Sanders, even Bernie Sanders (not sure if they are related) said something that echoed my sentiments about living in a free world you must be able to tolerate opposing opinions. Yes, a Jewish socialist even is taking our side. They claim we have no soul, but we are spiritually superior, in every way. Spiritual Aryanism cannot be objectively criticized without the peron criticizing us sound idiotic. Scientific Racism is able to be criticized like that. The fedora tippers of the world cannot fathom things being the Spinozaist "rational realism" they see and sense. This causes them to short circuit. tell that to the ACLU, who are gloating over her ejection from the Red Hen, saying that his supporters have no soul. besides the ACLU no longer defends 'civil rights' unless you're an 'oppressed minority'. this makes the concept of rights a joke and as they say "In Battle There Is No Law", a literally "War Of All Against All" suddenly my old view of "private business" is going away (has been for awhile). Since America is in a soft civil war, what better than our POTUS to suspend privatization of business until this is sorted out. They want to play hardball, hell, if I was in Trump's place, I'd go full National Bolshevik on their asses and make them pay into the government if they want to keep their business running, ipso facto, using force as a way to restore free speech in certain establishments. That's just my take. They want a fight, don't bring a fist fight to a bunch of thugs with hand grenades and rifles. we will experience Sparticus here like the Germans did in the early 1920s.

Personal Aphorisms And Bill Of Rights

GERMANY? UNCONQUERABLE?

It seems that I've seen a lot (mostly British folks) claim that Germany wants to Germanize the entire landscape of Europe by being its central hub. even though East Germany was under Soviet rule during the Cold war, the spirit was still there, until the fall of the wall in defence of "Liberty". Writers such as Spengler defended the German spirit in the 19th century into the 20th century, with Prussia (as it was called then) claiming land during the wars since the Franco-German war, with defeat in only one skirmish and the two major world wars. A thirst for power and imperialism is likely what caused it, not a drive for an eternal "German" spirit, but rather its leaders pushing the surrounding land masses around like bullies. I appreciate Prussian aesthetic, but lets not get carried away here, I'm purely Nordic-Celtic. of course internal conflicts were present which made fighting a fool's chance in hell (see the Sparticus uprisings, cursed be upon Rosa Luxemcunt), not only dealing with external conflicts as well as internal from the Jacobins. But largely, when it came for fighting one on one, without outside interference or internal interference, they succeeded in spades. So what's the deal with them now?

Well For starters, Herr Merkel has been driving the country into history books (likely because she is mentally disturbed and infantile, and people say I would be a shitty leader) She said and I quote "the way to combat migrant rape is to invite more immigrants into the state" Does that sound like a sane person to you. this time its not external, but rather purely internal, and organized by the state itself. How long must a country weep over the Holocaust just because if they don't, the EU will start flapping its lips over the chance of the course of history? And besides, Adolf Hitler actually liked Islam because of

a common enemy. He just wanted them in their own nations, as outside allies, not inside the country wreaking havoc. Its a fool's game, now that open displays of the Flag of Zion are "triggering" to Muslims. If Trump is the king of 44D Chess, Merkel is surely playing to levels higher than he is. I cannot imagine the kind of mental gymnastics that go through her sorry head everyday. She is so guilty about German war crimes, she committed a crime against her own people, only for the visiting party to induce antisemitism on their own. I guess if the so-called Aryans are unwilling to do it, those who experience direct conflict must physically remove them for her. Mind you most of the migrants aren't families or children but grown men. I guess you don't let a woman do a man's job. For fucks sake. Most National Socialist squeam at the idea that Russians and other Slavs are brethren and view them with airy disdain but as I'm not Putinist, it might take them to reconquista and establish a new Republic, just like they did in 1945 against the National Socialists. The true Aryan spirit lives in the east, not the west, and being in the middle of it all when your own leader (I speak of Germany) is committing societal suicide only to bring in migrants who hate jews anyways, because Merkel obviously doesn't love her own country so she has to create some sort of proxy war in the state she governs to show how weak her countrymen and women are. Of course lest we forget it was women who wanted this, nevermind the fact in their last election, former East Germany voted overwhelmingly against her being relected. She called the Stasi "monsters" when I feel she cannot even look in the mirror herself without being disgusted. even the Italian PM (at the time) called her an, and I quote, an "unfuckable Lardass". I guess either Germany looks to a former enemy for help or relive the Holocaust by proxy. Not that I care either way. They are doomed.

ARE WE STILL AT WAR?

For over a century, writers like Carl Schmidt believed that war was a constant thing, the personal was political. and it could be any sort of war, war could simply be internal conflict. As we see today in the post 9/11 world, the war has ended (for the most part) overseas. the conflict is within our own borders.

left vs. right is not an issue insoasmuch as the conflicts within the wings of political thought, intersectionality has failed in the left just as the right outs its own for not measuring up to a standard, as they say "purity spiraling". Recently jew lives matter, I mean Black Lives Matter didn't want gays to march alongside them, they are devouring themselves, the right, once united under the guise of MAGA and Trump are now completely destroying themselves (or as they would call it "separating the wheat from the chaff") in an attempt to long knife those who do not fit a singular standard. some go to the opposite side (see youtuber Shoeonhead), because of how extreme it is while the left can't seem to unite in any sort of harmony in a race to the bottom. war is constant, and while it may not involve physical threats, verbal takedowns and divisiveness continue to plague both sides. Eternal Utopia is not possible from either end. the rich still get richer while the poor get poorer. war is big business and its a game of profit. Through communicative ends, demonitzation on both sides is common, as long as the rich continue to reap profits from infighting. this is constant. oddly enough Leon Trotsky's idea of constant revolution wasn't far removed from idea that National Socialists such Carl Schmidt believe that war, conflict or otherwise, is a part of life. we are born, we struggle, we die. both were on opposing ends during the second World War and it seems to be that within the United States itself, this conflict cannot cease unless both sides unite to pacify who's really behind the infighting. in Donbass, Zionist forces continue to reap profits from both ends and it starts up as soon as it stop and then starts again. same goes in the middle East, former Yugoslavia, during Bill Clinton's regime and so on. But now its on our own turf between families, between friends, friends who were once enemies, and enemies who were once friends. But when does it cease? Conflict is eternal to humanity as the Spider/Fly tale (thanks Morticia Addams, always loved that series). If we do find peace eventually and the real enemies are driven out, Who knows what is around the corner? We all might be deceased by then and find a new way to argue. Cavemen probably argued over fishing vs. hunting, what got the most food for their families. In conclusion we must "make peace with conflict", for its eternal to the human struggle.

General Zyklon: Best Generation.....Or Not?

As of lately there's been a lot of hubub regarding this new generation of kids, namely Generation Z, and while I appreciate their sentiments, I have some issues. I was Xennial, born in 1982, and even with all the internet access kids have now, I had to resort to TV when I was younger, although AOL did come around early on, most of my information-seeking was done on Newsgroups (Xennials, remember those?) and TV shows on Hitler, Stalin and religious cults back in the 90s. back then, it wasn't common for someone to be, say 15-18 years old and be conservative, let alone knowing about the JQ. a lot of the time I was ostracized by peers, especially women when I let on my "real views". having to put on a mask during the lean Bill Clinton years was rough and knowing the federal government interference with Waco and Ruby Ridge was a tough burden to carry. being that I had early onset Autism, oftentimes, I would, like in 7th grade science class (1995-ish) I exclaimed to class "y'know Timothy McVeigh really didn't do anything wrong" the band Live was big at that time with their hit album "Throwing Copper" and "Lightning Crashes", which was around the time of the Alfred P. Murrah building. I didn't mind the song but I remember one kid saying that singing it meant you "hated the victims of 4/20/95 (94?) attacks on the FBI building. I dunno, kids are weird.

Anyways, I was always at odds with this new "90s bruh" thing and one girl told me I had the views of a 68 year old man. Like who, Barry Goldwater? a lot of my favorite bands stood against what I believed in (years before I discovered NSBM and martial industrial). The thing is, if you stood alone in a crowd of people saying "boo" back then and you say "yea" I felt you were doing something right. Now its easy for people like me to voice our views. but I digress. Many of them still, especially the younger Z-Gens still think the free market is cool, hey, guess what? so did I back then. things change. You get older, you have to pay bills, work, etc. Most kids I know that are younger than my brother are still stuck in that progressive/socdem mindset (especially the girls, women are biological wired to be liberal, something I may get into a later article)

Most of the best people post alt-right I've met weren't Z's, but rather everything from ex-skins from the 80s, to older Y and Xennials and Gen X types who felt as alone as me. obviously, and hopefully Gen Z's views will mature. Most of the older types prefered mixed economies or total Socialism (like left of Hitler Socialism) while still being hardcore Conservative on the social issues front, the rise of National Bolshevism among some outlier Z's is surprising considering they still think its a "meme". Sorry to say its not, Ernst Niekisch, Georges Sorel, Charles Maurras, Kai Murros, Eduard Liminov, and Giorgio "Franco" Freda (Aleksandr Dugin is ok but I don't feel as much of a connection with him much anymore) pioneered the ideas ages ago, in dank basements and secret offices, much to the chagrin of Soviet, French and German officals(they were de-Stalinizing at the time and even Stalin opposed them, one of them being a famous ex-White Army soldier by the name of Nikolai Ustraylov). that sense of danger, of fear, is what attracted me to the movement initially but it gave an alternative to the Lockean sense of "everyone deserves rights". Some do, some don't. The problem with Z is they take Hoppean dynamics quite seriously and think its the poor doing this. no, its mainly the rich and as we all know the rich tend to have echoes in the names. They will not admit that Pinochet took money from the Chicago Boys, a cavalcade of rich Jewish bankers. They will either a) throw helicopter memes at you (poor defense) or b) (unlikely) have their worldview destroyed considering they also idolize Adolf Hitler, which by all means

came into the NSDAP when it was still largely Socialist. or don't even mention that the majority of Mussolini's Fascist Party started out as Communists or Socialists. their brains are not fully developed yet and that's why they shit all over us like stool pigeons when met with facts about their heroes. They're a start but they will reach our ages in the coming decades and realize that the free market doesn't guarantee folk values and national solidarity.

As The Worm Turns, The Ouroboros Eats Itself

Upon the other day, I read an article about the revival of Carl Schmidt as a viable political figure. As you can see, Benedict Spinoza's nightmare has come true, surely as he stated that "philosophy can only be entertained within a democratic society (demos = Greek for people or folk, see "broken clock right twice a day on Winston Churchill, despite being a despicable man over all, had less than engaging views of the common voter) but what happens when the door is opened to interpretation insomuch that anti-Democratic views are being entertained in the said society? the cycle of political thought phases in and out, going through twists and turns like a story without end, keeping the reader engaged, in a recycling and reinterpretation of old views and novel views alike. Now that Schmidt is relevant, shall the Sephardic eat his own words? this gives rise to the idea that a revolutionary or a tyrant can rise like the Phoenix, not since the days of WW2 in the first world has the realm of skeptics and rationalists have devoured their own words to allow insomuch tolerance that non-tolerance is now a virtue. Now, I've said before, opportunism will rear its ugly head. the fact remains these opportunists would never have a foothold had the said society covered its bases by seeing the charlatan than Spinoza was and banned his books throughout Europe in the 17th century. But that's not Hegelian. its already been proven, even without empirical truth, that liberal democracy was predestined to arrive at this time by now. since most of your average citizen is too dumb to entertain democracy's privileges (voting, activism, etc), they sleepily go to the polls to vote in their own individual self-interest neverminding the fact that the police state always wins when they seek out the betterment of self over their people, even if democracy demands it. A faulty system as it stands, the democratic process is a process to seek imbalance no matter what, as many scholars have pointed out its "a tyranny of the majority". but no matter what, the state wins. so what's next, you say? well now that this society has become so liberalized and democratic

the Ouroboros devours the Ethics to entertain the presence of non-democratic ideas, hence why Schmidt is becoming ever so relevant. Now we seek what should have been done to Spinoza's writings of democratic philosophy, burned, feathered and tarred. Everyone has a platform now. you made the mistake of handing it to us. what follows a liberal society of free exchange? why Tyranny and Despotism ofc....as its predestined. To snuff out the ideas of the freeman, by freeman themselves who seek nothing more than to overthrow the current order since pandora's box is opened so far that nothing is off limits. And after the degradation of society, one will seek order, the pauper seeking a Prince, a Machiavellian man of the people, who speaks to them in the lowest common denominator to liberate them from the degradation of society's vices: consumerism, selfishness, capitalism, [insert any humanist progressive claptrap here]. see what I did? I turned Adorno on his head, the self-proclaimed purveyor of anti-Fascism who claimed all as previously stated as Fascism unto itself, the head of the Frankfurt School (which by all means was not entirely incorrect, but they went about it the wrong way, at worst an easy target for the uninformed about society's current ills, at best a bunch of useful idiots whose ideas can be explpited for better reasons). I see their ideas as tools, Machiavelli saw the saw the same thing, and maybe Schmidt to an extent that all ideas are tools unto themselves. out with the last man, in with the new man.

A Less Than Modest Proposal...

I have a proposal, if I'm the first philosopher to entertain ethical solipsism, let it be known, to the SJW that says "what's wrong with being replaced white boy, scared of the brown man cucking you?" "whats wrong white boy? scared of being around different people?" to them I say "whats wrong SJW? don't like me grooming sex slaves?" "whats wrong SJW, don't like rape?" "whats wrong SJW? don't want me eating people?" too bad, you brought this on your self, show to them how dastardly the rural underclass can be by being the ignoble savage. accelerate the collapse by transgressing them in return, so their utopian dreams fall to shit. war is progress, peace is stagnation, says Hegel. eternal war it shall be. the revolution shall be endless until it can be disposed of, to turn every cityscape into a farm, to lock out

business owners or stock traders out of every business, to hand the keys after the revolution to the state leader, lest be scorched earth until then, and when it happens, a state, less dependent on technology, more on farming and factories, we can finally gather at the local watering hole and debate because every business owner is a moderator, the state shall take a neutral stance for everything, and base a nation on labor, rather than lobbying and special interest fucking up what should be the freeman's land, the anarch, lest be someone who offends you I say unto thee, too bad! if you can't handle other ideas being entertained outside your bubble, you are free to go to your homestead where you are never confronted with another "problematic idea". the nation shall be built on an economic principle, ordained by God, and nary a complaint shall be filed on "he/she hurt my feels" nobody cares!

The Philosophy Of The Church And People's King (A Case For Theocratic Socialism)

The Philosophy of the Church And The People's King can be defined as a mostly socialist, somewhat libertarian philosophy ordained by the Church and God and a leader within which displays excellent virtuous, warrior, poet, philosopher ideals while remaining a man of the people. If we look at past philosophers such as Aristotle, and even as recent as Schmitt and Evola, they held the concept of authority. But how can an Aristocracy survive without putting its citizens first. Some of the early National Socialist economists such as the Strasser Brothers and Gottfried Feder, wanted to keep Germany a Worker's paraside through central banking and extremely high trade barriers. Adolf Hitler, destroyed this concept during the Night Of The Long Knives, when he destroyed the Working class, Leftist elements of his party to open Germany to free enterprise. Of Course, this would be his ultimate downfall and acquisition by outside Bolshevik forces, he became too Imperialist and Capitalist, and such greed and expansionism put his forces at great risk. This is not to say he once was, he was an excellent orator and could rile the crowd into a frenzy. His affect on Germany at first had Germany in complete emotional and Patriotic rapture. But that's not the be-all end-all of what makes a great country. His ties to the Church, the Pope, and to a way lesser extent, the Patriarchs of Russia had by intents and purposes may have been shaky. The leader of the Rexist party of Belgium, was later to be condemned by the Pope. He had ties to The Soviet Union but through underground means. As far as we know Hitler could've been an Atheist, a Pagan, an Agnostic, or actually Christian. We honestly don't know and only

perceive about him thru individual perspective and mostly thru Rose colored glasses. From what we've gathered, most fascist leaders were meritocrats, elected thru personal merit rather than ordained as a leader of the Lord. Falangism, early on might have been somewhat a people's republic, after the death of its founder, Antonio Rivera, who was already waging war against the Carlists, the next leader, Fransisco Franco, declared war against the working class. Seemed you couldn't have it both ways. Most Fascists in Europe began with great ideas, but ended up destroying its peasant class and poverty class peoples for free enterprise. Some of those were balanced between Monarchy and Fascism such as Italy but the King had no real power and was seen only as an unapproachable figurehead compared to Mussolini, who by his strong arm, led his people to what might've been a working class meritocratic state, but only to destroy the nation.

In the days of Feudalism, particularly, pre-Merchantile feudalism, they was much co-operation between the serfs and their overseers. The International Merchant, destroyed that notion by gross Imperialism, to conquer indigenious peoples, who may or may not have the means or the knowledge to understand what their conquerers were doing to them to spread what was to become early capitalism. Modern day Monarchy is a mere shadow of what it once was. The International Jew, various Freemasonry movements and The French Revolution, have rendered these people as not men and women of the working class but unapprochable figureheads who extert little to no executive power over their state and only a mass revolution could come back to reunite the Aristocrat with its own people, especially those work in low rent communities. International Jewry is nothing new, its gross Internationalism and Capitalism have destroyed Empires and destroyed relations between the people and their leader. The Gross atheism of modern times is a direct product of both rootless cosmopolitanism and internationalism. Democracy, which was a product of ancient Greece, has been rendered useless. We must have leaders not only in touch with God but its own working classes, away from the merchantiles and the rich that profit off the misery of others. Certain civil liberties must be perserved in order for the Socialist society not to dissolve completely into Stateless communism, the right to bear arms, freedom of speech and divisions of labor but only in the argicultural and resource realms, to perserve a semblance of private ownership.

But we must be highly protectionist, to avoid International merchantilism to destroy our country's moral fabric, Gottfried Feder wanted class war with the international elites. They have grown nigh powerful and he warned us about their tricks. We are not too late to restore aristocracy and centralized states. But it will take plenty of blood, sweat, and tears to achieve that. Direct worship of Money is rooted in satanic materialism, and the elites knew this. Aristocracies are few and far between because international trade and gross capital worship have rendered them powerless against the almighty dollar. We're starting to have urbanite millenials who only care about their special individuality and policing the language of others. Not only are they the modern day, rootless Aristocrats, they are also pawns of the international Jew. "Do As I Say, Not As I Do" say them. The stolen Holy Land of Israel has become its own insular superstate but they want to flood traditional cultures, mostly white European societies into ruin.

Because that's how they operate. They are very passive-aggressive, much like matriarchal societies, but that's for another chapter. Judas Iscariot is trying to drive his final nail into the coffin of Europe and even North America. This is very sad.

In 2015-16, Bernie Sanders wanted to bring Socialism to America. He was a flunkie on two accounts, 1, he was a chosenite 2, most of his followers were spoiled urban college students who didn't realize that social democracy had its roots in the international jew. But if you were to bring this up to them, you would get labeled "racist", "Anti-semite", etc. Even bringing up the fact that Wahabbism has its roots as far back as the imperialist wars of starting during the end of Ronald Reagan's presidency would fall on deaf ears. Most of them were not alive during that time. They are clueless and prime candidates for being "useful idiots". His war crimes aside, Pol Pot, did his best to destroy urbanites and hipsters back in the late 1970s. but he too, was a pawn of Communist internationalism and did little to help curb godless atheism (I have changed my mind about him since this article, more in favor). We need class warfare, but it must first be ordained by the Lord Jesus Christ himself. A Revolution thru the Church, if you will.

A likely response to a concern troll...

IntolerantSocialist said: Ginger dudes are considered low tier. it sucks because most are Germanic-Irish. thanks women, for wiping out phenotypes. fucking cunts.

He (I'm suspicious of it being male) replied: this only matters to virgin and angry stormfrontcels

I was going to ignore this on his own ignorance but I felt, well, I'll take the bait: how? and why? because somehow some people are more equal than others? I doubt there will be any unity among the incel communities as long as racial tensions continue to persist. such is life. nothing certainly matters to

most people if it doesn't benefit their in-group, the issue being that women naturally have stronger in-group preference than men does neither side justice. nor does it bring order. the fact my cousin was one of these types and a victim of opiates is mere anecdotal, nevertheless. male unity is nigh impossible considering that even virgin shaming occurs within these circles but also outside via the sjw-feminist ideological state apparatus. whats the point of pushing someone to suicide, besides while some may be suicidal, this alarming case of such things will persist as those fallen brothers will take arms up for their less competent brethren, resulting in more mass shootings. and yet, maybe all for the better. I don't see a problem with ethnic cleansing from either side. we have an overpopulation problem as it is, compounded by the state strong-arming poor men into supporting irresponsible female decisions. either or, a vastly feminine state is prone to famine as a strongly masculine state is prone to constant war. when one side overwhelms the other, the harsher reaction from either side is by each gender's natural inclinations. the sexual revolution and resultant feminism was a peaceful transition but not without its own problems, when the pendulum swings the other way it opens the door for brash displays of masculine aggression. though a balance is nigh inachievable, would rather err on the side of an orderly state governed by war rather than a weak state governed by famine.

On The Firearms Issue (How Far Do We Take Intersectionality?)

So why aren't autistics allowed firearm ownership but transgenders can? I asked this myself and parroted it to many other people, often getting "well that's just the way things are"

but there has to be more to it. I argued to my shrink that stats show the suicide rate of transgenders is abnormally high. though, a point must be made. plenty of those caught in (what some people would term as false flag) all had one thing in common: autism. was this some kind of joke? an elaborate pox on humanity? people will often argue, "well transgenders are more akin to getting attacked over their condition than autistic" boo hooey, I say. I'd wager its equal. though most autistics, being white and male, don't fit the archetype of the "oppressed individual". but it happens day in day out, and nobody does a thing about it? why? because "natural law, bruh" the same people that parrot this nonsense

become humanists for a day and mourn the "victims" of the end result of endless bullying because their school got holocausted. that's no concern of mine. everything is all "natural law" unless it affects you. heh. the same people who think profiling blacks is wrong will profile the fuck out of those with mental issues but leads me to another point. at one time in history, gays were considered "mentally ill". now they are not. so were "trans", but that's changing. so where do we draw the line? who gets profiled and who does not. of course I am absolutist in this, either there's a strong line or no line at all. whose to say a black man should be arrested for committing a crime pre-emptively to prevent said crime is somehow a "travesty of justice" but the overton window moves and that's not an issue anymore, as well with gays and trans people. but schizos? no, we have to lock them up. autists? them too. bipolar? gulag the fuck out of them. what even constitutes mental illness if we keep moving that window? the problem is the society which governs us globally (not pertaining to national law) is ostentatiously liberal, and because most people who have mental issues are primarily white, nobody cares. that's why seeing this world turn to piss and shit and vinegar is fun as an observer. let things get bad. let society consume itself under the weight of intersection. its why I'm essentialist, like Plato, this world would've been better if they hadn't "Descarted" his ideas (I love philosophy puns) in the first place. when we're at the bottom of the barrel, that's when I reach for my revolver, the one I pick off in Hobbes' famous 'war of all against all (Mission Of Burma has maybe 2 good songs, I hate art punks for the most part. hipster trash, the same kind that gentrify neighborhoods and then hire Jewish landlords to rip off the tenants in rent, its a Structure, the same kind Althusser and Gramsci talked about that enables capitalist exploitation) but enough of that. Bordiga said "it will happen". stop being an activist and let the shit slide into the gutter until its the STALKER/Fallout universe personified. Global warming is real, and so is scarcity of resources. Nick Land believes in acceleration. but instead of techno dystopia, a different kind of nightmare, the return of Rousseau's noble savage.

Why I'm Essentialist (moreso than anyone, especially those on the Left)

Someone on Quora said this

"This is something I've studied for debate.

Pro-Essentialism: We need categories.We need categorical thinking. Thats what definitions are.

The Civil Rights era reforms are build on essentialism.

Anti-Essentialism:Stereotypes are bad. Our categories need to be reflective of the diversity and reality (truth) within them."

the reason for me supporting essentialism apparently its due to my autism, according to an answer on there (I say this about myself not some jerk saying it for me). autistics are more likely to over-categorize things than non-autistics. that's why we're seen as asshole

"things must all fit into blocks"

the post-modern world looks at us as rude and backwards because of this pre-existing condition which causes our minds to never see in shades of gray

seeing in shades of gray is why tranny kids are running around and dancing for grown men

now I can see Hegel as being legit as he attempts to find middle ground through combining ideas and taking the best of both worlds. the problem with constructivists is they take the worst of both worlds. "everything is a social construct"

now I like Bataille and the way he mimics Hegel in the use of transgression, but I see it more as a tool to merge people with their inner selves than to promote the behavior in other people.

plus I really only see Bataille useful in the arts, not to be applied in real life. Postal 2 is a game, not something to imitate. though since if the slippery slope is real, might as well let it happen. but I refuse to take part in society's circus. I would rather observe how society is slipping, something Leftcomintern people like Bordiga would do. revolution can't happen with activism, nothing grassroots today is anything more than expensive, realistic looking astroturf. It will happen, but we have to reach the 9th circle before anything actually comes about it, man's last gasp. In an anonymous dialectic with a friend (this is why incels are considered dangerous just like Nazbols):

He said: I actually think nationalism itself is pretty dumb, and I'm too misanthropic to embrace it honestly anyway. The thing is nazbol still appeals to in the sense that its sort of political manifestation of the Left Hand Path, its highly "Satanic" in the sense that Satan is the adversary. Nazbol is the adversary to global capitalism, the US imperial hegemony, and the standardized morality of liberalism. The transgressive thrill of being what this society considers "evil" is a dionysian delight that I cannot refuse. Nazbol in its mentality is strikingly similar to the 7 fold sinister way of the order of nine angles as well. Its probably for this reason that I am attracted to the incel community as well, considering its also vilified in a similar way by the current establishment.

I said: Camille Paglia refused to acknowledge Dionysus due to the polemicists of the sixties trivializing the concept and went with Cthonic. Issue is chaos, even by mother nature can be a masculine execution. It's brutal, anarchic, punishing. Don't take shit from others and all be damned in your way. Women are more inclined to toe the legal line and political line and I often associate recklessness with men more than women. Women aren't natural risk takers. But that's bioessentialism and most Marxists would hate entertaining that idea. Even Jason Unruhe hates entertaining the idea. Its one of his flaws. I bet he doesn't even read Kojeve The ultimate left Hegelian. (I know damn well he doesn't read Augustine, it doesn't matter if he's an atheist, even Hegel said its good to read people you disagree with to find hidden truths and if he's up to the task it would be best for him to read it. No offense, Jason. Marx might have disagreed at points with Hegel but you damn know well even Uncle Karl read that shit)

(my part edited for clarity)

The "Transformers" Theorem (Something My Roommate Proposed)

Theorems suggest that order is achieved by machines, however against nature's disorganization (this was proposed by Norbert Wiener, as you can imagine he would have a low opinion of nature, but Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz saw neither nature or machine as oppositional), however Leibniz suggested that 'Monads' which are preceptions of one another leading to harmonies laid down by God. Leibniz also argued that mathematics was a language that connected human interaction and interactions with all existing beings, whether inaminate or animated. Einstein came up with a theory of relativity, which by all means optical and matter were "in the same ballpark". Though I disagree with Einstein, since his theories ended up lacking a message, which then again returned to optics. During the time of Norbert Wiener, a jewish mathematician, machines were not at the level they are today, with both Leibnizian theories and Wiener's own theory of message have converged in harmony to create modern artificial intelligence, and in turn the ability to turn robots from mere utilitarian mechanisms to almost human-like quality. Drawing on Leibniz's theory of the universe, if these Monads exist outside our own Monads on earth, Leibniz's expanding world would have to create something that has surpassed our own intellectual capabilities as human beings, as not all objects are created equal (This would predispose Leibniz's theory of Monads to be partially incorrect, along with the presence of evil, that not all that comes from these repeating, eternal patterns comes from a singular source, but rather, two different sources, feigning Gnosticism) This is further studied in the fact that tanks can overpower buildings, that planes can travel faster than cars, all this technology bearing down on us. But why has society

accelerated its technological advancement so quickly, and ever quicker the passing moment? could extraterrestrial beings have given us gifts from above? This also predisposes the problem of evil, are humans even capable of out-competing these new technologies? will humanity use them for good or evil? Looking at the past, we have seen great strides using technology and ebbing lows in the case of war, so I'd wager its a mix of both. Leibniz's theorems would lead us to believe not only in a higher power, but the existence of great powers that exist beyond us, in the form of aliens. So if the wager was given that we were handed technology for our own use would they seek to replace us? or live amongst us? There is a probability that a toy series and TV show was created of these beings, and movies to prove how insane such a proposition was, to silence opposition. The problem with human beings is we have the capability for reason, but are not always rational and using technology to help secure the planet from existential threats could very well be an existential threat to our own existence. Being the very possible reason they could use to help us, eventually they could control us. We must maintain a healthy skepticism of the ability of machines. They can be our worst enemy, but can also be a good friend.

What to do with NEETs?

Many philosophers have concluded that man is a social animal, who craves attention from his fellow man and worker. One thing that troubles me is a theorist such as Karl Marx believed that those who don't work, don't eat yet speak of alienation, a problem these folks endure everyday. That rare genius who sits in his room crafting figurines or spending time gaming or reading books can't usually stand the sight of another human being in his midst. Mostly a male phenomenon, considering men are more individualistic and not group-oriented like women are, many a sociologist and psychologist has claimed 'crowd mentality' is inherently feminine, the sheep who always fits in, follows orders. Hell I believe it was even Adolf Hitler who said, and I'm paraphrasing here, that if you win the hearts of the women, the men will follow, because men tend to question narratives much more than women do. Why are most conspiracy theorists and philosophers mostly men? well it lies in their eternal need to "get to the bottom of things", whereas considering mating rituals women will judge a man on first impressions, men will not, this also is why so many men are terminally single. Women have a sixth sense known as "initution" in which they judge within minutes of a conversation whether a man is worth his weight in gold. This dispararity leads to the NEET question. Why force these men to exit their comfort zones just

so they can eat, own a home, a car or if they don't comply, deny them basic needs? First of all, Marx isn't alive anymore, and I would try and impose a basic minimum unemployment income that applies to all, and even extend social safety nets to the working class. The increased reliance on technology is both a burden and an advantage to the NEET, he doesn't have to face people in person due to preconcieved notions of his condition, yet it also poses the problem of alienating the man from his fellow people, a society of introverts is no society at all, and it wouldn't function well, as people would start to distrust one another and possibly destroy the fabric of their community's existence. But say we removed most of reliance on technology, we would have more of an incentivization to bring those alienated by technological progress into the fold, and put pressure on them to give society a chance. I'm not saying that force is a good option, let them come to their senses on their own, people don't like being controlled unless they have a fetish for power-play. Because if this world collapses, We might have to rely on each other much more. It also doesn't help that women are often implicit in bullying lesser men because they expect things out of men that not all men can provide and these NEETs could use more male friends and a sense of belonging, because what this world needs is more men supporting each other and giving emotional platforms for us to vent and help us along the way, because of women's in-group preferences towards their own gender, women cannot always provide the emotional backbone for men to lean on and will just implore the man is being weak, because we all know how women will never question the status quo or the given presumptions about men without society changing, and that will take more than a war or two to cause that, also its worth noting women are also known to backstab their own men in the case of defeat, "war bride syndrome". Thats why women must be depersonalized in dire cases (in a law sense, not literal murder, like restriction of voting rights temporarily, et al) so as to not allow interference with the dialectical mode of history, whether material or not. Oftentimes political quizzes will question personal safety over freedom, well I choose the former, just to be safe, in times of crisis. once its over, then society can try helping out workers rights and giving them the fruits of their labor, land taxes to develop the lands, and eventually re-open the market, considering women are more inclined to be consumers and most advertising is aimed at them, as "women are human beings, men are human doings" as Warren Farrell put it, lets stop to consider that some men have no stake in doing anything for women or greater society, so this basic income can help them afford finer things without having to please greater society and push them to integrate into the community, with their own houses. What remains to be seen if this can be restricted to food, shelter and transportation, which it should be to allow for quicker integration. They don't have to climb the social ladder to impress other people, their boss, their lady (if they have one) or greater society. co-existing without participation. the inherent Socialist problem of "work or starve" must be set aside for those who are unable to work or unable to socialize, and I think this is something we should all consider, the psychology of it, the social implications of it, and the state as a whole.

John C Calhoun, His Principles And How They Can Be Applied Today

Disposition On Government, John C Calhoun's posthumously published and most well read work treads on the grounding that all men are social animals, and refutes Rousseau's claim of the noble savage, citing that in all eras of man, government was a necessity, from small caveman communities, to the Roman empire to the middle ages to today. However, in speaking of the individual, he speaks that one feels more strongly inclinated on how he feels personally than how he feels in relation to the group. Though in all senses those that execute a constitution of orders is drafted to keep the powers of absolute government in place, ordained by the almighty and those in service of the government, to take it a step further, must be above social feeling, and not be subject to the mob's orders, creating government. This sort of personalism is reflected in current events where some people won't obey Covid mask orders simply because they feel as if their rights have been infringed on. Man would perish alone, but we cannot refute the personalism of individuals so that they feel like they belong in the greater circle. Calhoun was a great critic of democracy and felt that majority rule was unjust and that we should have all a greater participation in the political process, and if one feels they are being singled out they will act as such, as he compared the science of politics to astronomy, how all planets align in orbit to complement one another so as to not upset the balance. He was by all intents and purposes, a communitarian with an emphasis on personal liberty. One should not have to cower in the face of an oppressive regime controlled by a majority opinion who do not care how those who voted against the majority feels. This kind of governance leads to friction and that's why there is a lot of turmoil going on right now in America. People will always disagree, that's a fact. But the preservation of our race and people is more important than ever and if we have unjust democracy ruling over a constitution of people, problems will continue to persist. in Ohio (where I live) I noticed a lot of people just "following orders" and cowering to a more powerful government, our state power is too large and DeWine will not budge on those orders. He gives states' rights a bad name and if anyone can see, with a disease of a 99.7% recovery rate and only really affecting old people (who if you think I think they deserve to die, you're mistaken). Yes restrictions on hospice visits should still be in place but if you're not around old people most of the time I don't see why unmasking is an issue. We just have to realize that until liberal democracy is done for it will persist and we must fight unjust majority rule. Calhoun would agree, if he were alive today.

Carl Jung, Sigmund Freud and "Libido"

Now one thing that motivates me these days is the study of Psychology, which Carl Jung would say is a form of "Libido". want to know why? well sit back and listen.

In the early days of the dissident right, I saw psychology as something inherently jewish, which while many psychologists in the early days were in fact Jewish (one only needs to look towards Sigmund Freud at this juncture to see why). Now philosophy and psychology have crossed paths many times. Schopenhauer saw this as the "Will", whereas Sigmund Freud was the first to categorize it as "Libido", where Jung and Freud disagreed was where they applied it. Freud only applied it to sexual desires and the "the drive to reproduce", Jung felt that the libido was not only our sexual drives but our needs to sleep, get up, play sports, drive a car, go to work, earn money, make friends and connections, he saw as as the all giving lifeforce that permeated living in-itself. this included, but was not limited to procreation. the limits of Freud's view was first proposed by Schopenhauer as a "will" a driving force to get what one wanted out of life. Of course, Schopenhauer saw a pessimistic view of this as no "will" could be satisfied without another appearing, thus leading to Freud's conclusion that our wills are in fact our libido, our desire to procreate, whether sexual or in an idealistic sense of giving life to another being or idea. This can be seen in Eduard Von Hartmann, a little known German philosopher who bridged the gap between Schopenhauer and Freud and was really only known for one book, The Philosophy Of The Unconscious, he even felt as if our intelligence increased, our drive towards death would as well. ouch. I explained in one of my videos about this, in an inverted manner of the "Worst possible worlds" argument would essentially prove better for humanity, a low IQ, high trust brutal environment, sort of echoing anarcho-primitivism.

But back to Jung. everything in our lives is permeated to "Libido", a lifeforce that drives us to do things to accomplish civilization. Libido can be seen as something that drives societal progress. A greater world is possible if we put our minds to this concept. however, its also reflected in the mundane, such as a drive to eat, a drive to sleep, or a drive to eat or anything that you do in everyday make the world go around. Seemingly he was a very optimistic man and it would come to be known that he objected to Schopenhauer's endless willing proposition as Schopenhauer didn't see much value in the world and felt that asceticism was the only escape from this predicament, one psychological luminary, Ernest Becker, saw all action as an avoidance of death, known as "Terror Management Theory", both these theories would seem like oil and water to Jung, who essentially saw life as worth living and worth pursuing and anything, even the smallest thing gave creedence to this "Libido", a life force that brings more life and the continuation of life itself on this planet we call Earth. though you would probably see me reading Lacan (a very confusing man) or Freud but one man sticks out as someone I cannot stand in psychology: Alfred Alder. I don't think I need to elaborate on that one. very negative to psychology. Hell I would read Becker before him.

Ted Kaczynski and Mathematics (And Other Luddite musings)

I'll be the first to admit I own a copy of the unabomber manifesto but I have yet to crack it open. so I'm going off what I know about why Theodore J. Kaczynski was calling out the Western left but never touched the positivist analytic school known as the Vienna Circle. This was likely because he was a professor of mathematics, and could find useful data on what he was studying to write this to be published in the New York Times. I would assume his findings came up with data referring to the usage of technology in relation to socialization among peoples. Our insistent dependence on technology (ironic I'm using it to write this blog, hindsight is 50/50) has created a class of atomized individuals dependent on instant gratification and while this has short-term benefits, he likely analyzed suicide rates, mental health issues in those most exposed to the greatest number of technological instruments. If he was deconstructing mathematics he likely would have found religion and his attacks would have had a "Jihad"-like mentality. I don't advocate for what he did, it was obviously wrong and people died, but he did it not to kill, but to make a general statement about our dependence on technology as a society. This

can be echoed in the writings of Oswald Spengler and Jacques Ellul with their increasing emphasis on "technique" or the mastery of tools in a given society, once a society reaches an epoch of understanding, they must make way for other cultures to grow exponentially, as the dreaded stage of "civilization" has been reached. Looking at his critiques of the post-modern left, you can see he was not pleased with how people in places like the Frankfurt School had infiltrated modern discourse with an emphasis on "thinking" instead of "doing". Now I'm no exception to this rule but I see it predominantly in the self-hating whites of black lives matter with their Maoist self-criticism and abuse towards themselves to the point of self-flagellation. they lack vigour and a willingness to break from group psychology (Ted was very keen on this too) to become better than their peers and make a break for it, a la Nietzsche. Instead they are guided by emotional pleas to irrationality. whilst Georges Sorel did see humans as reasonable, he also saw us as mostly, irrational, emotional creatures reminiscent of "Captain Caveman" (sound familiar?), and Ted, for all his work and knowledge was not exempt from this, besides having a keen understanding of the world he was also a very angry man, and nothing could conceal his contempt for modern man. I hope someday to write him a letter and ask him how he views humanity now vs. how he did when he was arrested. It would be an interesting letter correspondence. Now his views seem even more bleak but more proactive and wants to inspire those who want a break from the rat race and gain an ability to live without having to depend on the state to live comfortably and without the pain that modern society brings. I would give one word of advice to those attempting such things, that you must establish yourself with other people, and more and more people can live without the need for excessive modernization, learn bushcraft and basic survival skills, like hunting and fishing and homesteading. Because the world as it stands is accelerating and people are abusing themselves with Frankfurt and Maoist garbage, don't let it get to you. turn off your TV and take a walk. Even with this covid nonsense, its just more government intrusion. Maybe living away from modern society is whats best at this point, knowing that rural populations are affected less. I would much prefer to live in a one horse town than a sprawling metropolis and you can bet your bottom dollar it would improve my mental health. Hell, it would improve a lot of peoples' mental health to get away from it all. Ted was not criticizing the old left, because they emphasized community and wellbeing, he was attacking the neoliberal left that does nothing but flagellate themselves over a dead man. step out of the Matrix and not just exist. Live.

Religion And It's Place In Society

Remembering a few years ago reading Mircea Eliade I was introduced to the concept of profane and sacred space. And just recently a few months ago I read Jean-Jacques Rousseau and the social contract and these are two examples arcane and religious sociology. Let's compare the two.

While there is no central theme in Jean-Jacques Rousseau and the social contract where there's a presence of religion there is basic constructs where there is a unified agreement between peoples their leaders and their community Mircea Eliade takes this a step further by placing the importance of God in the middle of the community that unites people their leadersa creates an obligation between the sacred and the profane spaces that occupy their society. I did not know according to a friend of mine up until recently that Mircea Eliade could be considered a valid sociologist. but his emphasis on the community the people and a contract that exists between God the people and their leaders seemed that it could fit that mold. Where is Jean-Jacques Rousseau and his social contract is purely profane space Mircea Eliade takes it a step further and add the presence of God within Society this would later be expanded upon by people who by All Rights were atheists like Emile Durkheim, who while being against religion personally saw it as a general pillar of a functioning Society. This did not cross a mind of Jean-Jacques Rousseau who after the anti-catholic sentiment of the French revolution, religion would not have a proper place in his Society as everything will be a profane contract between citizen leader and his community as a whole. That's one of the many faults of the French revolution, of excising religion out of the daily lives of ordinary citizens. but much after the French revolution and the reaction against the Enlightenment principles, people began to reconsider the importance of religion as opposed during the Enlightenment period the unimportance of religion as a central pillar to forming a functioning community it started with Emile Durkheim and his principal of solidarism that preferred mechanical organism of society to the modern day Society where people were specialized in different fields as opposed to mechanical Society war everyone walked relatively the same job and secured the community as a whole. A lot of these older mechanical societies revolves around the revelation of a spirit or God, whereas modern society had specialized needs and with the advancement of Positivist methods such as math science and technology there was no need to have a central pillar that would guide Society and the proper direction it needed to go. All citizens basically had their needs met by profane science. Enter Mircea Eliade with his concept of sacred and profane spaces where he designated the outer world as profane space and even saw the central pillar of the community as a designated sacred space which society would revolve around mimicking the universe and all of God's creations. Many modern sociologists do not consider him a sociologist proper because of his insistence on religion and his anti-positivist ants on human organic Society and how society would function. I doubt that Mircea Eliade would want to envision a society that puts religion on the back burner an emphasized is the scientific method as a measure of human happiness but here we are now in the modern world and he would find it very cursed. It's sad that we've been without him for quite some time but at the same time I think it's better that he doesn't see Society for how it's functioning currently maybe one day we can return to an existence where we can balance the positivist methods of Science and technology without trying to disprove God as both our pillars of a progressive and conservative Society.

On Slavery...

In Aristotle's Politics, the concept of natural slavery is being contested with the gaping maws of those who dare to claim themselves the moral guardians and juries of justice in the current political climate. This can be divided among the Hegelian concept of the master/slave dialectic. Some groups, according to both psychology and political science practice a slave morality. This can be seen in sub-saharan Africa and the crowd mentality of white females after the George Floyd debacle, where a majority of people cower to a singular principle of complete cultural subservience to whatever the status quo, who practice master morality, will dictate to them.

Some countries as well practice a slave morality as well as they are resource rich and ripe for exploitation because those who occupy the land are not suitable for positions of a master morality and will let those resources go to waste if they are not appropriated correctly. J. Sakai was just expressing sour grapes in his book about settler colonialism simply because some cultures want to work for their labor, to earn the sweat of their brow, others want free handouts, such as in lower Africa. The African American is very similar in many respects that 'everything permissible thus free" and the welfare class puts many of these folks in a slave morality. Even in the USSR you were required to work to get what you wanted but essentially they are just imitating their forebearers in the idea that "if I beg I will get something in return"

This even extends to governance that if a country is too corrupt to govern itself, it acts as a slave to a master provisional government that would serve the citizens better, such as Chechnya after the Chechen wars to Russia and The Kremlin. To prevent the influx of migration from Mexico to the United States, I would forsee the United States using a similar method to Mexico and making a vassalage out of Mexico since it's apparent we as a people can use a master morality to serve their people better than the government they have in place.

Aristotle's concept showed that some are fit for rule and others for service, and even the Bible shows elements of predestination for people under God.

Ex:

For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth - Romans 9:11

In whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will - Ephesians 1:11

That is the word of God showing where people fit in society and will most certainly end up

Meditations on Husserl's First Ideas

It's seeming to me Husserl is turning Kant on his head, that the existence of properties of an object, taste, smell, color, texture are the most important to determination of an essence whereas Kant says that the absolute truth of an object exists outside of it's essence determined by individual experience. Furthermore, Husserl says that even in sciences that do not involve actual objects but ideals are on the same level as physical sciences, studies of objects are just as important as the study of an ideal number or measurement for absolute truth just as biologists study the existence of properties of an object, a seismologist might try and find an ideal measurement, which can also be physically traced into it's own essence, which are made of existence of different properties in themselves.

One thing I'm noticing about Husserl is that he dedicates a chapter to natural science, where I take issue with him and where he departs from Kant is his insistence on empiricism as a foundation of knowledge when Kant judged that most absolute truth lie outside the senses, however he critiques empiricists in the sense that theses regarding their knowledge of a given object can be applied to the object's surrounding essence and the theses themselves, that even the 'answers must be questioned'

in furthering my dissertations on Husserl he speaks of an imagined "flute playing centaur". As such things do not exist in real life, its our own personal experiences that shape the essence of the given object that makes us perceive "the flute playing centaur" that all given objects and ideas are perceived through experience of that object, it can be percieved without "acting" on it, that sometimes our conscience can be doubted. that all empirical knowledge can be doubted if one dissects the experiences surrounding the said object.

Another meditation on Husserl. reading more, I've noticed that Husserl and I make the same assumption as I did in one of my books that oftentimes ideas (eidetic thinking) are often as the essence of an object or concept is merely a given, a reflection of someone's prejudiced thinking towards that given object or concept rather than what it actually is, furthermore, each object or concept or equation can be deduced to to bias when some grand problem is solved it often rests upon the biases of those doing the work to examine the object's properties and what they deduce from it. One other example is that numbers or equations are often constructs in themselves, the same way a language is a construct, they each communicate an idea but were built upon the presupposition that these concepts were needed to communicate ideas (eidetic thinking) to one another person, i.e., to give meaning to something. (opinion: I believe this was so society could progress further and basically all concepts can be reduced to shapes, numbers and letters.) however even those must be looked upon critically as, said before that empirical judgments must also be empirically dissected because all things are taken experience of the object in-itself a collection of details that make up an object or idea.

in furthering my dissertations on Husserl he speaks of an imagined "flute playing centaur". As such things do not exist in real life, its our own personal experiences that shape the essence of the given object that makes us perceive "the flute playing centaur" that all given objects and ideas are perceived through experience of that object, it can be percieved without "acting" on it, that sometimes our conscience can be doubted. that all empirical knowledge can be doubted if one dissects the experiences surrounding the said object.

in Husserl's words, natural science is the way that most people should judge things, therefore it must be judged based on the observations of experienced figures and movements of said objects. A positivist will judge things based solely on the empirical given essence of the object whereas the natural scientist will judge based on the experienced movements and figures and signs of said object. the experience of phantasy, still owes geometric insights into said object as even fantastical observations must have lines, connections, points and can be drawn out through the mind.

in the end of Husserl's first dissertation he makes a clear distinction between the empirical, skeptical "philosophy of nature" and the rigid, closed off "natural science" of mathematics, analytics, and other rigid "hard sciences", the being that all of the "philosophy of nature" can be questioned of its essence by the object of study's experiences whereas "natural science" is rigid and cannot be put into question, whereas the philosophy of nature and philosophy in general uses skepticism and empiricism to search for a complete sense of knowledge as these act as hindrances in the search for a natural scientific pursuit of knowledge, thus making natural science superior. just my take.

In his second section of "Ideas" Husserl determines all objects and persons in nature to be "intuitively" sensed, with varying degrees of attention, that all objects within it's past and present can be sensed such as the sound of child he may have heard earlier that recollecting in his mind or the books at present upon his desk. Here we can see the objective "natural" perception of things as experienced by their existential qualities rather than their essential qualities. We all know that babies cry because it's essential knowledge passed to us but we don't know for sure unless we've experienced the existence of a crying baby and we ourselves, can deduce this is real for ourselves.

Husserl states everything appears the same as to one and different to others as they exist for all in a intersubjective web. The environment in which these subjects exist can be deduced to the "other" at the very least, and the subject can escalate this to proper theories of what the "other" constitutes as a thinking subject, with different theories of the "others" existence.

reading more into Husserl, the cogito, the acts of the ego, that any expression can be on hand, such as coming and going, loving and hating, bringing and taking, etc. any act done within the Cartesian axiom can be of one that demands pure focus, whether it be arithmetic, language, or expressional art, that any can be accomplished whether each act demands an expression that is used to accompany any focus towards an object or idea, and that each act can use one or more simultaneous acts to use the object or idea.

Husserl states everything appears the same as to one and different to others as they exist for all in a intersubjective web. The environment in which these subjects exist can be deduced to the "other" at the very least, and the subject can escalate this to proper theories of what the "other" constitutes as a thinking subject, with different theories of the "others" existence.

In Husserl's alteration of the thesis of bracketing, one must suspend something if it becomes the antithesis of its existence, that what is on hand is the conscious object and it is no longer on hand if one cannot perceive it therefore becoming its antithesis, doubting it does not change or transform its main properties, but it can suspend the object's giveness so attempts can be made to doubt it however its properties do not change, its merely "doubted" and not "suspended". to "suspend" its judgement must allow it to become the other, and putting it out of action, therefore becoming its own "void", the unknown.

In the end of the first chapter of Husserl's ideas, Husserl invokes an Empiricist anti Positivist attitude in that all things "on hand"can be "suspended" or "bracketed" in that the proof of their existence cannot be deducted to mere numbers or measurements, that their existence is solely determined on how the person perceives the object as it exists in their world or presence, that they must be perceived metaphysically and not "positive" actuality. That they exist for only the perceiver and not for anyone else, invoking Berkeley.

Aphorisms And "Bill Of Rights"

1. People who often say "freedom of speech comes with consequences" either fight in packs like cowards or cannot fight at all

2. my views on nationalism are based upon religion, the marcionite creed of opposing semitic influence in the code of national ethics, without them, we are better off.

3. if penis size correlates with intellect, that could very well explain the drop in global IQ.

4. it always never fails to upset Orthodox Marxists who talk a big game about unproductive labor vs. productive labor, when in reality, childbirth and rearing is productive labor and say you want to redistribute the means of that production to all working class men.

5. "you're a fed" is just the right wing equivalent of "you're a class traitor" on the left.

6. Tbh it seems the left have gave up on the working class as a whole lately and I mean the real marxist left not what right wingers deem as "left", writing them off as "reactionary". Is there a reason for this? Seems both sides are out of touch with one another making it easier for us third positionists to grab their attention". I think it has to do with the right seeing people as tools for capital exploitation, and the left seeing people as expendable labor,making man one with his machine and eventually dissolving the distinction, through dialectics. there's a reason transhumanism as seen as progressive, or leftist"

7. all historicism has an agenda, whether it be Progressive (John Stuart Mill), Materialist (Karl Marx) or Cultural (Oswald Spengler)

8. xenoracism is a concept I developed to advance Nick Land 's concept of "hyper-racism" in that it pits the mongrelized anti-realism of American races over those of "pure" European phenotypes in a sense of emphasizing dysgenic behavior traits that when collectivized, bring a greater sense of barbarism towards those who oppose a neocolonial mindset

9. the biggest advocates for diversity are often big tech, who see large capital gains and if thats not enough, imagine a world without conflict, that even in the age of machines will just amount to republics of commerce engaging in actual warfare on a battlefield. which means, the liberal IR theory of peace and non-hedgemony is a pipedream, and conflict will always exist no matter what circumstances are present, especially if there is more than one institution in existence that is not all encompassing.

10. true ableism is when they give guns to transgenders but not autistics/schizophrenics/bipolars because we're "a danger to society" who really is more dangerous. rhetorical question. most of us want peace and not to be bothered. meanwhile transgenders are borderline personality addled, histrionic messes who mutilate their own genitalia and off themselves by 30. in short, modern psychiatry is a joke.

11. what constitutes "social etiquette" is just an expression of feelings and wills.

12. blacks are often a co-dependent people, either through welfare or they demand reparations. slavery aside, they seem to be hardwired to be allergic to actual productive labor and even if they owned their means of production they would still demand that its "not enough"

13. Social darwinism is an inherently individualistic ideology that is incompatible with Fascism, Social darwinism on the right is survival of business monopoly, on the left it's survival of the proletarian. The

third positionist avoids both hazards by being a third alternative to either/or Therefore making it the most stable and unbreakable political Institutions known to man

14. woke politics began in the 90s with critical theory becoming increasing specialized and scientism pushing kids out of churches and into arms of atheism, case in point, rock the vote campaigns, the rise of bill clinton, who is southern in only the sense he came from there, conspiracy theorists looked at as right wing whackos and trailer trash, Ruby Ridge, Waco. also the advent of "trash TV", and Bill Nye pushing theories of evolutionism over creationism and science becoming dogmatic instead of abject expression of man's highest ideal as a child of God

15. "Presuppositionalists compare their presupposition against other ultimate standards such as reason, empirical experience, and subjective feeling" insoasfar as I believe reason is subjective feeling, the Hume is-ought defense taken in debates where say I was to argue with Sam Harris I would believe his moral statements would be statements of his emotion because of his latent atheism not having anything other than arbitary morals.

16. Marxists talk a big game about material conditions, but even atoms can be reduced to binary code, which depending on your metaphysics whether numbers exist or not

17. "Dunning-Kruger" is not some miraculous discovery. its the natural state of tribes.

18. the only way to stop capitalism is to not, instead try and make capitalism in a way it mimics the effects of socialism

19. the problem with the left is the infighting, the problem with the right is they don't read theory or at least misinterpret what they read.

20. post-modernist philosophers act if "America/West Bad" is a new narrative when its been the narrative since the 60s. so using Lyotard's logic, we should dismantle that one too

21. in a sort of Foucauldian manner, Kamala Harris was picked by the democrats because I think blacks have an internal desire to be imprisoned.

22. not saying Richard Rorty was wrong but he speaks of bad education vs. good education. why do we need education when everything is just a matter of opinion.

23. According to Deleuze, he despised marginalized people, when in fact there is a hierarchy, 3) gays and minorities, who produce the least and waste the most 2) women, who produce more but are still wasteful, and 1) the mentally ill, who are shamans. Remember Alexander The Great bowed to Diogenes.

24. In Aristotle's concept of natural slavery, there is a need for America to have countries in their sphere, as some countries (Mexico, third world) practice 'slave morality'

25. The problem with critics of Pascal's Wager is that without an oppressive state is they would act in their own desires, and more often than not it would be morally detrimental to greater society. So one needs either or, or "Both".

26. the first major age of constent laws were passed in America right around the time of jewish mass migration to the states. something to think about.

JJ Barger